

Exhibit 29

MAKING A MURDERER

Ep 6 v1 / 3.9.15

GENERAL:

Length: This episode is an hour and 30 min. While the court scenes are captivating we need to ensure that we're providing the essential evidence, of which there is a bounty! Let's trim where we can to ensure continued engagement and keep the pace and transition in a way that we don't lose folks in unnecessary detail unless it will play into key evidence in later episodes.

We're in a lot of detail until at around minute 39, we speak to the fact that they're at day 18 of testimony & provide a summary of facts to date via the defense attorneys. This is a welcome organizing moment to help the viewer ground all of the testimony, but let's make sure that viewers get there and are not lost before.

As an example, Dr. Leslie Eisenberg: Forensic Anthropologist, her testimony in particular is important and thoughtful, but comparatively very boring and lulling. Can we cut directly to her admitting that she can't reasonably support that there might be more than 1 burn site? When combined by the later testimony of Dr. Scott Fairgrieve: Author of "Forensic Cremation Recovery & Analysis" saying that he actually finds the evidence to be more supportive of the theory that the body was burned elsewhere and brought over is powerful. We need to really build and hold this moment.

Pete: An overall note as he appears across multiple episodes. Can we do something to help further substantiate who he is and why his POV is valid? He does such a good job of providing context and articulating just how out of normal protocol and extraordinary the investigation has been to date. Let's make sure he is substantiated and believable based upon his past history.

Opening Credit Sequence: Let's discuss today next steps for the graphics treatment.

Beginning: Instead of just the date, can we provide another line of context of who and what we're about to see? It's important that these cards reset the scene for the viewer, especially to remain consistent from where the viewer left off in the previous episode. Also to relabel the characters at the beginning.

Avery's Parents: It's heartbreaking and effective to have this up close look at parents watching their innocent son in this situation. However, it feels that we're leaning in on Avery's parents too much overall. For example, we don't need the scene of Steven's dad talking about how much blood a deer holds. Please revisit overall.

AMOUNT OF QUARTS OF BLOOD: During the testimonies, there seems to be a different number. Please review just to be sure.

SPECIFIC:

7:33 - Re-label Steven's lawyers here. Again, to have them relabeled at their first appearance at the beginning of each episode will be helpful for the audience, even if some of these characters are consistent in each.

17:40 - 17:55 - Can we label these exhibits? Where/what? Even if there's someone describing at certain parts, it'll be helpful to both see and hear.

45:00 aprx - in this area, the testimony of Linda Eisenberg starts to really drag. The defense attorney, Strang, drags in his line of questioning as well, specifically, in his summary of events at approximately 47 minutes. We know this is an important narrative, however is there perhaps a way to make this just as impactful, but also more concise.

52:19- 55:00 - Feels like this section is lagging a bit overall. Can see if maybe speeding up Dr. Scott Fairgrieve testimony will help? It's important information but, again like Eisenberg, could if possible, use some tightening.

1:06 - Brendan Dassey's testimony section feels long - if possible, perhaps an area to tighten. Please revisit.

1:09:00 - Love the character of the woman bus driver, Buchner. She gives impactful testimony and comes across very credible.

1:12:03- The transition into FBI witness, Lebeau, feels very low energy. Can we explore ways to transition stronger into this FBI witness, maybe in a kinetic way? Since this is another significant witness, if we can transition into him in a stronger, more interesting way it should set him up better (especially for his statement at 1:15:35).

1:17:00- BIG QUESTION: Why would the FBI have a specific interest in covering up for and possibly aiding and abetting with Manitowoc County? Seems like we would maybe need to know that Manitowoc had some deep history with Lebeau/other FBI officials for them to testify in the case in such a subject manner. We are not saying we shouldn't do this arc, it just feels unlikely. This was something we bumped on. Let's discuss.